



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE OLD ENGLISH GLOSSES PRINTED IN
KLUGE'S *ANGELSÄCHSISCHES LESEBUCH*.³

V. THE LEIDEN GLOSSES.

AN entirely new feature of the *Lesebuch*'s 3d edition is the glosses from the *Leiden*. They are not in the 2d edition, and have probably been added because of the insufficiency¹ of Sweet's print of them. Kluge's text differs from that of Sweet (1) by his conspicuous tendency to normalize the Latin lemmata, a tendency which does not stop short at direct substitution as in the case of No. 12, where *argumenta* is put for the *arguta* on record in the ms.² Another case in point is the substitution of *remis* for the recorded *rimis* in No. 112. I wish to reiterate what I have previously said on the interpretation *bordremum* standing for *bordsemum*. Kluge's assumption of an OE. *bordrēma*, 'oar,' seems to me quite untenable; (2) by the dropping of 12 glosses printed by Sweet; (3) by the addition

¹In addition to Steinmeyer's strictures (*ZfDA.* 33. 248 = *AfDA.* 15. 248, note 1), Kluge refers in his introductory remarks, *Lesebuch*³, p. 10, l. 1, to *Ahd. Gl.* 4. 482. I presume 482 is misprint for 484, for on p. 484 Steinmeyer has the following: 'H. Sweet, *The Oldest English Texts* s. 111-117: über den wert dieser ausgabe s. Z. 33. 248f. anm. und H. Logeman im *Moyen age*, sept. 1890, der sich zwar den anschein gibt, gegen mich zu polemisieren, in wahrheit aber nur für mein urteil über Sweet's leistung neue belege beibringt.'

²This *argumenta* is a conjecture of Steinmeyer. Sweet, misunderstanding the latter's *l.* (= *lies*) for *l.* (= *uel*), rashly gave in the Appendix *arguta uel argumenta* as reading of the ms. As a matter of fact, only *arguta* is read there, and this must stand. Steinmeyer would not have meddled with it, either, had he seen what Glogger points out on p. 15 of his Commentary, and I had found out prior to him, namely, that the gloss is to be referred to *arguta sophismatum interrogatione* of the *Vita S. Antonii* (Migne 73), c. XLVI, p. 158; *ordancas* is either = *orðanca s̄* = *orðanca saxonice*, and interprets *sophismatum*, or a mistake for *ordancas* = *orðance saxonice*, interpreting the entire phrase.

of 9 glosses omitted by Sweet. The following numbers of Sweet have been dropped by Kluge:

- No. 2 *pro exercitu appuli: huuitabar = invitabam* (Steinmeyer).
 28 *sescuplum: dridehalpf* (marked by Sweet as OHG.).
 31 *poderis, etc.: loth* (condemned by Sweet himself in the Appendix).
 41 *delet: hnabot* (condemned by Sweet in the Appendix on St.'s authority).
 48 *capitio: haubitloh* (marked by Sweet as OHG.).
 59 *ancillis animalibus: figl = figuli* (Steinmeyer), *figuraliter* (Glogger).
 63 *tenda: gezlt* (marked by Sweet as OHG.).
 70 *nemias, alio nomine: atersatha* (shown by Steinmeyer to be another name for *Nehemias*).
 98 *baratrum: loh uel dal*.
 243 *acrifolium: holera* (asserted by St. to be Latin *olera*).
 253 *excellentes gipparre* (OHG. according to St., though not so marked by Sweet).
 257 *opere p'etium necessarium uel neos: (uel = t* shown by Logeman to be in reality the upright stroke | that was to separate *neos* as belonging to the preceding *extra*, *extraneos* being the interpretation of *extores*).

Of the 9 glosses absent from Sweet's text, but printed by Kluge, 4 had already been added by Sweet in the Appendix on Steinmeyer's authority; they are:

- No. 5^a *soeue: su* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 746. 17); *soeue = sues* (Steinmeyer).
 8^a *lurida: pox* (read *þox*) (= *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 746. 29).
 40^b *lappa: clitē* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 1. 666. 3).
 75^a *scena*¹ *imitatio t grina* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 341. 4).

The other 5 (4 of which had been pointed out by Steinmeyer) are Kluge's addition:

¹Steinmeyer reads *sarra*, Goetz *so///rra*, Glogger *scina*, admitting the possibility of reading *scurra*. I shall have to deal with this gloss later on.

- 1^a *laena toscia*¹ (= *C. G. L.* 5. 413. 61).
 40 *litura impensa lim uel clam* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 1. 640. 1).
 40^a *paxillus negil* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 1. 640. 7).
 61^a *palae*² *sculdre* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 1. 481. 13).
 99^a *subsaltare intrepetan* (= *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 597. 37).
 Cf. *qui caleat trippat, id est ludit*, *Ahd. Gl.* 3. 602. 29.

This list of additions may be considerably increased, now that we have access to the complete Leiden glossary through the meritorious labors of Father Plazidus Glogger (Augsburg, 1901). A number of additional glosses have already been pointed out by the same author in his painstaking commentary on the *Leidensis* (Augsburg, 1903). Those of them I consider as certain I shall print below along with my own work, distinguishing them by a star :

- (1) Before Sweet's No. 1 add **turnodo = co]thurno uoðe* (fol. 22b/I. Glogger's edition, p. 28, **16**. 10). The gloss is from *Sulp. Seueri Dial.*, ed. Halm, p. 179. 19.
- (2) After Kluge's No. 7, Sweet's No. 6. add *conclauia. porticos = porticas* (fol. 22b/II. Glogger, p. 29, **82**. 4).
- (3) After Sweet-Kluge's No. 28 add (a) *uiscerade = uiscereāde = uiscere innaðe* (fol. 23b/I. Glogg., p. 33, **15**. 21). The gloss may refer to Aldh., p. 253, No. 10. 1, just as the preceding *uiscide* to Aldh., p. 109. 31.
- (4) After No. 28 insert (b) *catastā. lupā = catastam. lupan* (fol. 23b/I. Glogg., p. 33, **15**. 26). Here we have the OE. *lūpe* (*lūpa*) posited by Holthausen as etymon of NE. *loop*. See *Archiv f. d. Stud. d. N. Spr.* III. 418. For *catasta = turba hominum uel animalium corrigia ligata* cf. *Hist. Gildae*, ed. Jos. Stevenson, London, 1838, p. 31, § 23 : *item mittit satellitum canumque prolixiore catastam*. The original meaning of OE. *lūpe* (*lūpa*) will, of course,

¹ On this gloss see my article in *Anglia* 26. 301.

² With this lemma I shall have to deal in the chapter on Kluge's normalisation. Preliminarily I want to state that Steinmeyer *l. l.* prints as reading of the *Leiden*: *lapates in similitudine scul drē*, as reading of the *Carlsruhe. Aug. CXXXV*, *lapates .i. in similitudine palae .i. sculdre*.

have been 'loop, leash' (cf. ME. *lowpe*; *amentum*, *ansa*, *corrigia* in the *Cath. Angl.*, p. 222^a). But no doubt it was used also in the same figurative sense as modern 'leash, string.' OE. *lūpe* (*lūpa*) is further testified to by the compound *lȳpenwyrhta*, i. e. *lȳpanwyrhta* we read *WW.* 275. 25 and 359. 5. Sweet in his *Dictionary* assumes this to mean 'tanner,' evidently because of the lemma *byrseus*, which in *WW.* 359. 5 appears with the alternative interpretation *leðerwyrhta*. I would suggest that the glossator interpreting *byrseus* by *leðerwyrhta* oððe *lȳpenwyrhta* did not so much wish to convey the idea that *lȳpenwyrhta* was a synonym of *leðerwyrhta* as he wanted to say that the *coriarius* he undoubtedly found as gloss to *byrseus* might mean 'tanner' as well as 'loop-maker,' that is to say, *coriarius*, in common pronunciation, must have sounded pretty much like *corrigiarius*. But to return to *catasta*, a use of the word similar to the one pointed out above is on record in *WW.* 201. 15–17 *catasta uel geled quadrup[ed]alium*, 'a lead of fourfooted animals.' This gloss, along with *WW.* 275. 35 = 369. 15 = *Ep. Ef.* 229 = *Cp.* 363, refers to the *catasta* of Aldh., p. 94. 27, as I have shown in *Thes. Gloss. Emend.*, ed. Goetz, p. 189^a. Hence it is evident that the *Erfurt's* reading *geleod* (= *gelead*) alone deserves credence in preference to the *gloed*¹ of *Epinal* or the *geloed* of *Corpus*, and Kluge cannot be right in assuming that the glossator wishes to convey the idea of an instrument of torture (glossary to *Lesebuch*³, p. 180^a s. v. *glæd*). See also *NED.* *sub* lead sb² 2^d: 'lead = a leash or string for leading a dog.' In the Aldhelm passage a 'lead' of dogs, a pack of hounds, is meant by *catasta*, and, similarly, Blackmore in chapter 13 of his *Lorna Doone* speaks of a *lead of red deer*.

- (5) After No. 28 insert (c) *raucos. crispantes* = *raucos. rispante* = *raucos. hryscande saxonice* (fol. 23b/I. Glogg.,

¹ Cf. *groeto* (*mereo* = *maereo* of *Corp.* 1305, for *greoto*?)

p. 33, **15.** 32). As to the omission of *h*, cf. *uastrung* (*murmur*).

- (6) After No. 40^a insert **arihel lio* (fol. 25b/II. Glogg., p. 43, **24.** 23). As Hebrew *Arihel* means 'hearth of God,' Glogger takes *lio* to stand for *hliow* = *hlēow* 'warm place, fire-place.' On the strength of *Ahd. Gl.* 4. 240, note 2, *Arihel int̃p̃r leo dī* = *Arihel interpretatur leo domini*, I think it much more probable that *lio* is meant for lion; cf. *WW.* 438. 22 *leo lio*. Steinmeyer seems also to have held this opinion; cf. *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 640, note 6; *ibid.* 4. 55, note 19.
- (7) After No. 43 insert **sacelli. sedes diminutiui* = *sēodes diminutiue* (fol. 26a/II. Glogg., p. 45, **26.** 17).
- (8) Restore No. 63 *tenda. trabus*¹ = *tenda. traefhūs* (fol. 27a/I. Glogg., p. 49, **29.** 24). What follows, *geztt*, printed as the only interpretation by Sweet, is of course OHG., and irrelevant here.
- (9) After No. 80 insert **passus idē fetim* = *passus id est fethim* (= *fæthm*), not, as Glogger proposes, *fēt III* (fol. 30a/I. Glogger, p. 53, **41.** 32).
- (10) After No. 81 insert *scatentibus. credenti* = *crēodendi* (fol. 30b/II. Glogg., p. 67, **44.** 30). The gloss has been previously pointed out by me in this *Journal*, but with a different explanation. The identification of *credenti* with *crēodendi* is Glogger's.
- (11) After No. 92 insert *coalescant. pascant* = *coalescant. wascaht* = *wacsath* (fol. 31b/I. Glogg., p. 70, **47.** 25). This gloss has been previously pointed out by me in this *Journal*. Compare *coalescere. adolescere* (fol. 36a/I. Glogg., p. 93, **65.** 32). On *n* for *h* cf. *nefern* = *hefern* *Ef.* 1106; on *ht* for *th* cf. *obgibeh̃t* = *obgibeth*, *Cp.* 631; *broht* = *broth*, *Cp.* 2139.
- (12) After No. 128 insert *forinnadas. interior pars nauis* = *fori. ^{innaðas} interior pars nauis* (fol. 34a/II. Glogg., p. 83, **58.** 28).

¹ MS. has the abbreviation *trab̃*.

- (13) After No. 251 insert *uacillante. fugantē = uacillantem wagiende* (fol. 35b/II. Glogg., p. 91, 64. 28).

I am doubtful as to *adfecit. distauit* (fol. 36a/I. Glogg., p. 92. 10). If Glogger is right in referring the gloss to Cassian's (Nv. 1, p. 302. 13) *iniuria affecit*, then it is possible that *distauit* stands either for *bitauit* = *bitauit saxonice*, or for *biš tauit* = *bismore tauit* = [to] *bismore tauit*. The glossator may have read *adfecit* = *adfecit* = *adficit*. As to *biš* representing *bismore*, cf. Napier's *OEG*. 23. 41, *sinew = sinewcalt*. As to *adfecit* = *adficit*, cf. *C.G.L.* 5. 292. 5 *exercit = exercet*, and numerous other similar instances.

As to the 12 glosses dropped by Kluge, I hardly think anybody will find fault with his judgment, as far as Nos. 2, 31, 40, 48, 59, 63, 70 and 257 are concerned. But in regard to Nos. 28, 98, 243 and 253, a more or less successful plea may be made for retention. As a champion for Nos. 28, 243 and 253 has recently come forward Plazidus Glogger in his commentary on the Leiden glosses, Augsburg, 1903, pp. 21, 86, 88. I fully agree with him that the OHG. look of *dridehalpf* may be due to the continental scribe mixing up OHG. *drithalp* with OE. *drīðehalf* in No. 28. *Holera* in No. 243 seems to be vouched for as OE. by the *holegn* of *Ep. Ef.* 34 = *Cp.* 53 and, I would add, by the apparent unfitness of Latin *olera* as interpretation of *acrifolium*. We should expect at least *olus* or *genus oleris*, if not rather *lignum* or *genus ligni*. *Holera* can well be conceived as mistake for *holena*, and *acrifoliū* may stand for *acrifoliū*. The reading of *Ep. Ef. Cp.* would then appear to be a deliberate change to the nom. sg. For *gipparre* in No. 253 Glogger suggests an original OE. *gēapra* (-e). I should like to put in a good word also for No. 98, *baratrum loh uel dal*. At any rate, we should not lightly set aside the direct testimony of the *Codex S. Galli* 299 as to the Old English character of the interpretation. According to Steinmeyer, *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 597. 33, this codex reads the gloss in the following way: *baratrum lōh t dāl*, the *s* above

the interpretations evidently standing for *Saxonice* (cp. *Ahd. Gl.* 2. 597. 27, *rogus beël t eād*, *ibid.* 2. 597. 29, *fatum wyʳd*; *ibid.* 2. 597. 47, *lineolis drēdū*, as readings of the same codex). It would seem that Kluge's reason for rejecting the gloss was the apparently Old High German character of *loh*, which he evidently read as *lōh*. But for all that the *o* of the word may be long, and *lōh* easily connects itself with either *slōh*¹ (*WW.* 220. 32, *deuium*), or *clōh* (= Modern English *clough* = NHG. *Klinge i. e. Gebirgsbach, Schlucht*). The initial *s* (or *c*) may have dropped through the carelessness of some scribe. *S* especially, if that was the initial, was liable to disappear, as it might be taken for *š* = *siue*. Perhaps even *lōh* can stand; it may represent a Latin *lanc-*, on record in *lanx* and *lancinare*. At any rate, I believe I have shown the possibility of crediting the testimony of the St. Gallensis as to the Old English character of *loh*. *Lōh* certainly seems to me to make as good, if not a better, showing than the alleged OE. interpretations of either of the two following glosses, not challenged by Kluge:

No. 242 *philocain scopon*

No. 254 *sanguisugae levas*.

Philocain is of course the *φιλοκαλιν* of *C. G. L.* 3. 321. 50, and as that is interpreted by *scopa*, suspicion is very strong that the above alleged OE. *scopon* goes back to an original Latin *scopā*; *φιλοκάλιν* is late Greek for *φιλοκάλιον*. As to *levas*, note in the first place that Sweet, against the clear testimony of Steinmeyer, gives *lecas*² as reading of the MS. (see *Anglia* 26. 301). Secondly, Steinmeyer distinctly says that *levas* is Middle Latin (see *Anglia* l. l.), referring to the gloss in the Schlettstadt Cassian-glossary (*Ahd. Gl.* 2. 153. 55), *sanguisuges. levas egila*. I do not see how we can afford to disregard such

¹ *slōh* appears only as masculine or neuter in Sweet's *Dictionary*, p. 156a, but it is on record also as a strong feminine in *fisuras scisuras idest sloaesax of Erfurt*² (Sweet's No. 1114). The Glossary to Sweet's OET. takes no cognizance of the word. I once tried in this *Journal* to explain *sloae* as corruption of *slaed*; I take this occasion to retract my conjecture as unnecessary.

² Also in No. 22 Sweet gives *poas* (for *poccas*) as the reading of the ms.

testimony, especially when coupled with the fact that the *Leidensis* fails to mark *lexas* in the usual way as OE. interpretation. *Lexas* may be by-form of *lixas*; they are called blood-suckers because of the well-known tendency of these traders to over-charge and cheat the soldiers they dealt with out of their money.

VI. THE LORICA GLOSSES.

It is to be regretted that Kluge did not include the Lorica glosses as a new feature of the *Lesebuch's* 3d edition. He would perhaps have cleared away all doubt concerning some points of Sweet's text which are still left problematical even by a comparison with the latest print of the glosses as published on pp. 85–88 of Dom A. B. Kuypers' complete edition of Ædeluud's Prayer Book, commonly called the Book of Cerne, Cambridge, 1902. In the first place, we should like to get certainty as to what glosses really are the work of the first hand, and how far Sweet's text is reliable as a presentation of it. I have noticed two important discrepancies between Sweet's text and that of Kuypers: (1) After Sweet's No. 59, Kuypers stars *crura* as gloss by the first hand. The gloss is absent from Sweet's text, and should be inserted as No. 59^a, if Kuypers is right; (2) as No. 56 Sweet prints *genuclis* :: :: :: *banū*; in a note he says that the whole word is erased; may be *hweorf-banū*, certainly not *speorbanum*, as suggested by Cockayne. Kuypers fails to star the gloss, thereby indicating that he does not consider it the work of the first hand; he also has *baanum* for Sweet's *banū*; as to the word erased, he agrees with Sweet that it may have been *hweorf-baanum*, 'altered to *cniewum* later.' Now neither Sweet nor Kuypers is explicit enough to settle all doubt concerning this gloss. Kuypers prints *genuclis* ^(cniewum) *baanum*, and from that it would appear, as it seems to appear from Sweet's print, that only *hweorf* is erased, while the wording of Sweet's note at least implies that the entire *hweorfbānū* is erased. Kuypers' note, '*hweorf-baanum* (?)', altered to *cniewum* later,' when taken together with the way he prints the gloss, might

easily lead one to infer that he wishes to convey the idea that *cniewum* is on the erasure of *hweorf* only. The same lack of explicitness is to be observed in the following instances where Kuypers' print diverges from that of Sweet:

- (1) Sweet's No. 11^b *pelta plægsceldæ*: (Kuypers) ^{plæg sceldæ*} *pelta* ;
- (2) Sweet's No. 14 *cephalem heafudponnan*: (Kuypers) ^{heafud ponnan*} *cephalem* ;
- (3) Sweet's No. 16 *conas egan*: (Kuypers) ^{ða egan*} *conas* ;
- (4) Sweet's No. 20 *michinas næsðyrel*: (Kuypers) ^{ða næs ðyrel*} *michinas* ;
- (5) Sweet's No. 33 *supercilis oferbruū*: (Kuypers) ^{ofer bruum*} *supercilis* ;
- (6) Sweet's No. 42 *gurgilioni ðrotbollar*: (Kuypers) ^{ðrot ballan*} *gurgilioni* ;
- (7) Sweet's No. 43 *sublinguae tungedrum*: (Kuypers) ^{tung eðrum*} *sublingue* ;
- (8) Sweet's No. 51 *renibus lundleogu*: (Kuypers) ^{tund leogum*} *renibus* ;
- (9) Sweet's No. 52 *catacrinas huppbaan*: (Kuypers) ^{hupp baan*} *cata crinas* ;
- (10) Sweet's No. 62 *reniculos lundleogan*: (Kuypers) ^{lund leogan*} *reniculos* ;
- (11) Sweet's No. 63 *fithrem snædelðearm*: (Kuypers) ^{snædel ðearm*} *fithrem* ;
- (12) Sweet's No. 66 *toracem feoluferð*:¹ (Kuypers) ^{feolu ferð*} *toracem* ;
- (13) Sweet's No. 67 *fibras smælðearmas*: (Kuypers) ^{smæl ðearmas*} *fibras* ;
- (14) Sweet's No. 68 *bucliamine heorthoman*: (Kuypers) ^{by heorthoman*} *bucliamine*.

¹ I wish to reiterate what I have said on this word in *Anglia* 26. 287-288, and again draw attention to *WW.* 203. 11 *feleferð* (*centumcilio* .i. *pellis* & *centumpellis*), *ibid.* 610. 37 *the felvalde* (*scruta exta* .i. *tripe*, and *Ahd. Gl.* 3. 321. 22 *uileuar*, (*omasus*). In addition, cf. the Papias gloss quoted by Goetz, *Thes. Gloss. Emend.* s. v. *omasum stomachus uel uenter centipellis uel uentriculus*, whence it is clear, I hope, that we have to do not with the bird-name *fieldfare*, but with a term for the tripe called *manifold*. Of course, that is not the proper interpretation of *thoracem*; it belongs rather to the preceding *toleam* as alternative with *readan*, and *readan* is not plural, as Sweet would have us believe (see his *Dictionary*, p. 139b), nor does it mean 'tonsils', but it is the acc. sg. of *rēada*, which is mod. dial. *read*, 'the stomach of an animal, spec. the fourth stomach of a ruminant,' as *NED.* explains it. The *WW.*-gloss, 159. 38, *tolia uel por-unula reada* quoted there, is not the earliest instance, but our *Lorica*-gloss (Sweet's *Lr.* 65). Also in the Irish *Lorica tolea* is interpreted by a word for 'stomach' (*ingaille*).

In regard to all of the instances quoted, there is, in the absence of an explicit statement on Kuypers' part and in view of his varying practice,¹ considerable doubt left in our minds as to the scope of the star he affixes to the gloss, and we are led to ask whether the star is to mark off as work of the first hand *all* parts of the gloss printed above the Latin word, including the articles, etc., appearing in *Nos.* 2, 3, 4, and 68, or just that part to which it is affixed.¹ In view of the divergencies of Sweet's print, it is surely important to get authentic information about this point. Explicitness is also required in regard to what Kuypers means by 'later' as applied to alterations of glosses. Does he use it (laxely) as an equivalent of 'in the later hand' or to convey the idea that the alteration is by the same hand that wrote the original gloss, only later in time? The question is pertinent, considering the divergencies of statement I observe relative to *ofer* in (*ofer*)*bruū* (*tautonibus*), Sweet's No. 38. Sweet says that *ofer* is prefixed in the later hand; according to Kuypers, *bruum* was altered to *oferbruum* 'later.' Just so the *e* of *alle* (*pantes*), No. 72, is erased; *e* prefixed by the later hand, *teste Sweetio*, but Kuypers says that *alle* was altered to *eall* 'later.' Compare also his use of 'later' in regard to the alteration *cniewum* in No. 56. Of other divergencies between Sweet's and Kuypers' prints I have noticed the following :

- (1) In No. 35 *buccis smerum* Sweet fails to indicate that the *u* of *buccis* seems to be over an erasure.
- (2) In No. 48 *cubitis fæðmū* Sweet fails to indicate that the reading of the first hand was probably *cubis*, altered to *cubitis* (*ti* interlined) by the second hand.
- (3) No. 52 Sweet prints *catacrinas* against *cata crinas* of Kuypers.
- (4) In No. 55 Sweet has *suras*, failing to indicate that the

¹ Cf. e. g. Sweet's No. 2 *lacerandum* : *to teorenne* with Kuypers' ^{*to teorenne**} *lacerandum*. Here the star evidently refers to *teorenne* and *to*, as the facsimile of the opening page, printed on p. 84a of Kuypers' work, shows. But Sweet's No. 74 appears as ^{*ic*sio*wegen**} *vehar* in Kuypers' print.

original reading was *surras*, altered later to *suras* by erasure of the first *r*.

- (5) In No. 58 Sweet prints *tibiis sconcū*, failing to indicate that the original *tibis* was altered to *tibiis* later.

Why Sweet should have chosen to print as a unit No. 7, *omne malum a me pereat gewite*, while it appears from Kuypers' print that *gewite* glosses only *pereat*, or No. 4, *ceteros agonithetas cempan*, when, according to K., *cempan* glosses only *agonithetas*, or why in No. 8 he should have printed as one gloss *pactum firmum feriat were trume fæstnie*, or in No. 11 *libera tuta pella gefria ðine plægscelandæ*, when in reality (see Kuypers) there are as many different glosses as there are words, seems all the more strange, as he prints as two separate glosses No. 70 *turtuosis gebegdū* and No. 71 *intestinis isernum*, which appear as *turtuosis cum isernum* in Kuypers, and form just as much a grammatical unit as the above quoted, and No. 9 *mei gibrae mines lichoman*.

On p. 84b of Kuypers' work there is a facsimile plate of the opening page of the *Lorica* (Book of Cerne, fol. 43). This plate enables us to check the reliability of about the third part of Kuypers' print of the *Lorica*. It would seem from it that it has not been Kuypers' aim faithfully to reproduce in his transcript the exact state of things in the original. Fol. 43a, ll. 1-2 appear in Kuypers' transcript thus: *hanc luricam loding cantauit ter in omne die*

^{gemiltsa} ^{Sio byrnes}
SUFFAGARE TRINITATI

As a matter of fact the MS., as shown by the facsimile, has *luricā*; *ter* is quite faint and appears to have been erased; the words *in omne die* are written below AGARE. In the marked off space above ARETRINITATI traces of capital letters appear very faintly outlined; inspection of the MS. itself would perhaps enable us to read them.

L. 4 Kuypers has ^{ic biðde} ^{me} ^{ic biðde me}
quaesso mihi against *quaesso mihi* of facsimile.
^{mid him} ^{midht}
5 “ “ *secum* against *secum* “ “

L. 7 Kuypers has ^{from þam hyhstan} *á sublimibus* against ^{frō þā hyhstan} *á sublimib*; of facsimile.
^{þam hiofondcundan¹} *caelestis* against ^{þā hiofondcundan} *caelestis*
 8 “ “ ^{foriæton} *linguant* against ^{foriætan} *linguant* “ “

13 Kuypers agrees with Sweet in stating that the first hand's *ðicce* above *denso* was altered to *þy ðiccan* by the later hand; but this is not borne out by the facsimile. After repeated inspection and comparison, I feel bound to say that the alteration appears to be made by a hand at least contemporary with the first. There is hardly any difference in either the tracing of the letters or the color of the ink. But there is a marked difference in either respect with the following *gescyldende*, which plainly betrays its origin by the later hand.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

WOLFENBÜTTEL, GERMANY.

¹ *sic*!